

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 10-16 and 19-23 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-7, 10-16 and 19-23 have been rejected.

Claims 1-5, 10-14 and 19-23 have been amended as set forth herein.

Claims 1-7, 10-16 and 19-23 remain pending in this application.

Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. CLAIM REJECTIONS -- 35 U.S.C. § 112

In Sections 1-5 of the July 9, 2008, Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. With respect to Claims 1 and 10, the Examiner stated that the limitation "said data packets" in lines 14 and 18 of Claim 1 and lines 15 and 19 of Claim 10 is indefinite due to insufficient antecedent basis, since it is allegedly unclear to which of the data packets recited earlier in Claims 1 and 10 this phrase refers. The Applicants note that amendments made herein have obviated this objection. With respect to Claims 2-5, 11-14 and 19-23, the Examiner stated that the limitation "said security and classification functions" are indefinite due to insufficient antecedent basis, since it is allegedly unclear to which of the security and classification functions recited earlier in this claims. The Applicants note that amendments made herein have obviated this objection.

II. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 6, 7, 10, 15, 16 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0231625 to *Calvignac, et al.*, (hereinafter “Calvignac”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,393,026 to *Irwin*, (hereinafter “Irwin”). Claims 2, 5, 11, 14, 20 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Calvignac reference in view of Irwin reference, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,197,035 to *Asano*, (hereinafter “Asano”). Claims 3, 4, 12, 13, 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Calvignac reference in view of Irwin reference, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0100956 to *Watanabe*, (hereinafter “Watanabe”). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

In *ex parte* examination of patent applications, the Patent Office bears the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. MPEP § 2142, p. 2100-133 (8th ed. rev. 4, October 2005). Absent such a *prima facie* case, the applicants are under no obligation to produce evidence of nonobviousness. *Id.* To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met: *Id.* First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. *Id.* Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. *Id.* Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *Id.* The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicants’ disclosure.

Id.

The Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to amended Claim 1, which recites the unique and novel limitations emphasized below:

1. A router for interconnecting external devices coupled to said router, said router comprising:
 - a switch fabric; and
 - a plurality of routing nodes coupled to said switch fabric, wherein each of said plurality of routing nodes comprises:
 - a first network processor comprising a first plurality of microengines, each of said first plurality of microengines for performing first security and classification functions associated with data packets received from said external devices and transmitted to said switch fabric, wherein each data packet is distributed to a selected microengine; and
 - a second network processor comprising a second plurality of microengines, each of said second plurality of microengines for performing second security and classification functions associated with data packets received from said switch fabric and transmitted to said external devices, wherein each data packet is distributed to a selected microengine (*Emphasis added*).

The Applicants respectfully submit that at least the above emphasized limitations are not described in the cited references.

In rejecting independent Claims 1, 10 and 19, the Examiner acknowledged that Calvignac fails to disclose the limitation of a network processor comprising a plurality of microengines. However, the Examiner asserted that Irwin discloses a routing blade implemented using a multiprocessor architecture.

In column 6, lines 1-25, however, Irwin describes a multiprocessor system comprising master nodes and slave nodes, where each slave node may execute any required procedure for the processing of a data packet. The master nodes perform procedure calls by sending them to the array of slave processors, one of which executes the procedure. As made clear in column 5, lines 42-45, "rather

than dedicating a processor to a single data packet, the data packet processing is distributed to the processor array.” As such, Irvin teaches away from the invention as recited in Claim 1.

For at least these reasons, the prior art references cited by the Examiner do not teach or suggest the unique and novel limitations recited in independent Claim 1, as amended. Amended independent Claims 10 and 19 recite limitations that are analogous to the unique and novel limitations cited in Claim 1 and are also patentable over the cited prior art references. Additionally, dependent Claims 2-7, 11-16, and 20-23 depend from the independent Claims 1, 10 and 19, respectively, and contain all of the unique and novel limitations recited in Claims 1, 10 and 19, respectively. This being the case, these dependent claims are also patentable over the cited prior art references.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the § 103 rejection with respect to these claims.

CONCLUSION

As a result of the foregoing, the Applicants assert that the remaining Claims in the Application are in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests an early allowance of such Claims.

If any issues arise, or if the Examiner has any suggestions for expediting allowance of this Application, the Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below or at *jmockler@munckcarter.com*.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees connected with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0208.

Respectfully submitted,

MUNCK CARTER, P.C.

Date: 8 Sept. 2008



John T. Mockler
Registration No. 39,775

P.O. Drawer 800889
Dallas, Texas 75380
(972) 628-3600 (main number)
(972) 628-3616 (fax)
E-mail: *jmockler@munckcarter.com*